

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of September 3, 2008 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 23, 35, 46, 48 and 49 have been amended and claims 29, 36-45 and 50 have been cancelled by way of this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 23-28, 30-35 and 46-49 are currently pending in this application with claim 23 being in independent form. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by way of this Amendment.

#### **Withdrawn Claims:**

Claims 44-49 stood withdrawn from further consideration as being drawn to a nonelected invention. Claims 44 and 45 have been cancelled by way of this Amendment and claims 46-49 have been amended to depend from independent claim 23. Claims 46-49 therefore share the same special technical features of amended claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder and consideration of claims 46-49.

#### **Claim Objection:**

Claim 36 has been objected to because the limitation "said series of bodies" lacks antecedent basis in the claims. Claim 35 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 36, which has been cancelled, and those limitations have been given proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Prior Art Rejections:**

Claim 50 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for anticipation by German Patent Application Publication No. DE 4324522 to Krauss (hereinafter "Krauss"). Claims 23, 24, 27-29, 32-38 and 40-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Belgian Patent No. BE 502991 to Societe Technique Pour L'Utilisation de la Precontrainte (hereinafter "STUP") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,003,545 to Tanaka (hereinafter "Tanaka") and Krauss. Claims 25, 26, 30, 31 and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over STUP in view of Tanaka and Krauss, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,688,071 to Evers et al. (hereinafter "Evers"). In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention, as defined by amended claim 23, is directed to a method for coupling concrete parts wherein one of the parts is provided with projecting metal reinforcing bars which are encased in the concrete of the one part and the other of the

concrete parts is provided with cavities which match with the reinforcing bars, wherein the reinforcing bars are secured in the cavities, the securing step comprises the step of filling the space between the concrete part and the metal part with a material which bonds to the metal part and to the concrete part and wherein the concrete part having cavities which extend from an outer wall thereof, of providing a formwork, of placing a body against an inner side of the formwork, the shape of which body at least partially corresponds to the cavity and that side of which body that adjoins the concrete material comprising an elastomer material, the mechanical properties of the body being such that, when tensile force is applied to the body in the vicinity of a boundary surface, the diameter of the body is considerably reduced, with the result that the body, after the concrete has been poured and at least partially set, can be removed from the shaped cavity, which diameter of the body can be elastically reduced, of pouring and at least partially setting the concrete, detaching the formwork and the body.

Applicant submits that STUP, Tanaka, Krauss and Evers, taken separately or combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of amended claim 23.

With regard to STUP, this reference teaches forming cavities in molded concrete material using removable rigid rod that is surrounded by a deformable elastic material so that the elastic material may be stretched and the rigid rod removed after the concrete has set. STUP does not teach or suggest a method for coupling concrete parts wherein one of the parts is already provided with projecting metal reinforcing bars encased in concrete and the other of the parts is has cavities to match those reinforcing bars formed therein by being molded about a formwork including a body corresponding to the shape of the cavity and including an elastomer material that allows the diameter of the body to be reduced, as is claimed.

With regard to Tanaka, this reference teaches a core member used in a molding flask for making prefabricated concrete components. The core member includes a hollow tubular member of predetermined size having all outer surfaces intended to be in contact with concrete mixture covered by a thin layer of rubber plate. Tanaka does not teach or suggest a method for coupling concrete parts wherein one of the parts is already provided with projecting metal reinforcing bars encased in concrete and the other of the parts has cavities to match those reinforcing bars formed therein by being molded about a formwork including a body corresponding to the shape of the cavity and including an elastomer material that allows the diameter of the body to be reduced, as is claimed, and therefore does not fairly

suggest a modification to the method taught by STUP that reaches the claimed invention.

With regard to Krauss, this reference teaches concrete sections that are joined by passing a single hollow lance through each of the concrete sections and material injected into a space between the lance and a cylindrical shell in order to secure the lance in place. Krauss does not teach or suggest a method for coupling concrete parts wherein one of the parts is already provided with projecting metal reinforcing bars encased in concrete and the other of the parts has cavities to match those reinforcing bars formed therein by being molded about a formwork including a body corresponding to the shape of the cavity and including an elastomer material that allows the diameter of the body to be reduced, as is claimed, and therefore does not fairly suggest a modification to the method taught by STUP that reaches the claimed invention.

With regard to Evers, this reference teaches concrete structures joined by anchor rods having ribbed anchoring sections and threaded joining sections. Evers does not teach or suggest a method for coupling concrete parts wherein one of the parts is already provided with projecting metal reinforcing bars encased in concrete and the other of the parts has cavities to match those reinforcing bars formed therein by being molded about a formwork including a body corresponding to the shape of the cavity and including an elastomer material that allows the diameter of the body to be reduced, as is claimed, and therefore does not fairly suggest a modification to the method taught by STUP, that reaches the claimed invention.

Applicant submits that independent claim 23 is allowable for at least the foregoing reasons, as the prior art of record, including STUP, Tanaka, Krauss and Evers, fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Claims 24-28, 30-35 and 46-49 are dependent upon and add further limitations to independent claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 23. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.


Application No. 10/519,273  
Paper Dated: February 3, 2009  
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of September 3, 2008  
Attorney Docket No. 0470-048023

**Conclusion:**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of claims 23-28, 30-35 and 46-49 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By \_\_\_\_\_

  
John W. Zerr  
Registration No. 56,009  
Attorney for Applicant  
436 Seventh Avenue  
700 Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: (412) 471-8815  
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094  
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com